| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |

Defendant QuikOrder, Inc. ("QuikOrder") responds to the Second Amended Complaint filed by Ameranth, Inc. ("Ameranth"), and states as follows:

I. <u>ANSWER</u>

PARTIES

- 1. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 1 and therefore denies them.
- 2. The allegations in paragraph 2 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 2 and therefore denies them.
- 3. The allegations in paragraph 3 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 3 and therefore denies them.
- 4. The allegations in paragraph 4 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 4 and therefore denies them.
- 5. The allegations in paragraph 5 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 5 and therefore denies them.
- 6. The allegations in paragraph 6 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 6 and therefore denies them.
- 7. The allegations in paragraph 7 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or

27

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 7 and therefore denies them.

- 8. The allegations in paragraph 8 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 8 and therefore denies them.
- 9. QuikOrder admits that it is an Illinois Corporation having a principle place of business in Chicago, Illinois. QuikOrder denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 9.
- 10. The allegations in paragraph 10 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 10 and therefore denies them.
- 11. The allegations in paragraph 11 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 11 and therefore denies them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. QuikOrder admits that Ameranth's Second Amended Complaint purports to state a claim for patent infringement.
- 13. QuikOrder admits that jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 14. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 14 and therefore denies them.
- 15. QuikOrder admits that QuikOrder is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Judicial District and denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 15.

INC.'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

16. QuikOrder admits that venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b), with respect to QuikOrder. With respect to the remaining defendants, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief

- 3 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS
DEFENDANT OUIKORDER, INC.'S AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO AMERANTH.

| 1 | as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16 and therefore denies them. |
|----|--|
| 2 | <u>BACKGROUND</u> |
| 3 | 17. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to |
| 4 | the truth of the allegations in paragraph 17 and therefore denies them. |
| 5 | 18. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to |
| 6 | the truth of the allegations in paragraph 18 and therefore denies them. |
| 7 | 19. QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 19. |
| 8 | 20. QuikOrder admits that Ameranth is asserting two patents in this lawsuit, which on |
| 9 | their face appear to be assigned to Ameranth Wireless. With respect to the remaining allegations |
| 10 | in paragraph 20, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to |
| 11 | the truth of the allegations in paragraph 20 and therefore denies them. |
| 12 | Count I |
| 13 | Patent Infringement (U.S. Pat. No. 6,384,850) |
| 14 | (35 U.S.C. § 271) |
| 15 | 21. QuikOrder incorporates its responses in paragraphs 1-20 as if set forth fully |
| 16 | herein. |
| 17 | 22. QuikOrder admits that Exhibit A appears to be a copy of United States Patent |
| 18 | No. 6,384,850 entitled "Information Management and Synchronous Communications System |
| 19 | with Menu Generation" ("the '850 patent") and that the document speaks for itself. QuikOrder |
| 20 | denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 22. |
| 21 | 23. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to |
| 22 | the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23 and therefore denies them. |
| 23 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 |
| 24 | Patent by Defendant Pizza Hut |
| 25 | 24. The allegations in paragraph 24 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 26 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 27 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24 and |
| 28 | therefore denies them. |
| LP | - 4 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS |

- 25. The allegations in paragraph 25 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 and therefore denies them.
- 26. The allegations in paragraph 26 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 26 and therefore denies them.
- 27. The allegations in paragraph 27 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 27 and therefore denies them.
- 28. The allegations in paragraph 28 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 28 and therefore denies them.
- 29. The allegations in paragraph 29 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 29 and therefore denies them.
- 30. The allegations in paragraph 30 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 30 and therefore denies them.
- 31. The allegations in paragraph 31 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 31 and therefore denies them.

QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 37 and The allegations in paragraph 38 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS DEFENDANT OUIKORDER, INC.'S AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO AMERANTH, INC.'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 38 and therefore denies them.

- 39. The allegations in paragraph 39 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 39 and therefore denies them.
- 40. The allegations in paragraph 40 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 40 and therefore denies them.
- 41. The allegations in paragraph 41 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 41 and therefore denies them.
- 42. The allegations in paragraph 42 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 42 and therefore denies them.
- 43. The allegations in paragraph 43 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 43 and therefore denies them.
- 44. The allegations in paragraph 44 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 44 and therefore denies them.
- 45. The allegations in paragraph 45 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or

| 1 |
|----|
| 2 |
| |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |
| 26 |
| 27 |

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 45 and therefore denies them.

<u>Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850</u> Patent by Defendant Papa John's

- 46. The allegations in paragraph 46 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 46 and therefore denies them.
- 47. The allegations in paragraph 47 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 47 and therefore denies them.
- 48. The allegations in paragraph 48 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 48 and therefore denies them.
- 49. The allegations in paragraph 49 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 49 and therefore denies them.
- 50. The allegations in paragraph 50 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 50 and therefore denies them.
- 51. The allegations in paragraph 51 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 51 and therefore denies them.

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 58 and therefore denies them.

- 59. The allegations in paragraph 59 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 59 and therefore denies them.
- 60. The allegations in paragraph 60 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 60 and therefore denies them.
- 61. The allegations in paragraph 61 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 61 and therefore denies them.
- 62. The allegations in paragraph 62 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 62 and therefore denies them.
- 63. The allegations in paragraph 63 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 63 and therefore denies them.
- 64. The allegations in paragraph 64 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 64 and therefore denies them.
- 65. The allegations in paragraph 65 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 65 and therefore denies them.

- 66. The allegations in paragraph 66 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 66 and therefore denies them.
- 67. The allegations in paragraph 67 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 67 and therefore denies them.

Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 Patent by Defendant GrubHub

- 68. The allegations in paragraph 68 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 68 and therefore denies them.
- 69. The allegations in paragraph 69 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 69 and therefore denies them.
- 70. The allegations in paragraph 70 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 70 and therefore denies them.
- 71. The allegations in paragraph 71 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 71 and therefore denies them.

- 72. The allegations in paragraph 72 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 72 and therefore denies them.
- 73. The allegations in paragraph 73 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 73 and therefore denies them.
- 74. The allegations in paragraph 74 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 74 and therefore denies them.
- 75. The allegations in paragraph 75 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 75 and therefore denies them.
- 76. The allegations in paragraph 76 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 76 and therefore denies them.
- 77. The allegations in paragraph 77 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 77 and therefore denies them.
- 78. The allegations in paragraph 78 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 78 and therefore denies them.

| 1 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 |
|-----|--|
| 2 | Patent by Defendant LaughStub |
| 3 | 79. The allegations in paragraph 79 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 4 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 5 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 79 and |
| 6 | therefore denies them. |
| 7 | 80. The allegations in paragraph 80 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 8 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 9 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 80 and |
| 10 | therefore denies them. |
| 11 | 81. The allegations in paragraph 81 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 12 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 13 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 81 and |
| 14 | therefore denies them. |
| 15 | 82. The allegations in paragraph 82 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 16 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 17 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 82 and |
| 18 | therefore denies them. |
| 19 | 83. The allegations in paragraph 83 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 20 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 21 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 83 and |
| 22 | therefore denies them. |
| 23 | 84. The allegations in paragraph 84 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 24 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 25 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 84 and |
| 26 | therefore denies them. |
| 27 | 85. The allegations in paragraph 85 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 28 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| TIP | 10 |

| 1 | i |
|----|----|
| 2 | tl |
| 3 | |
| 4 | (|
| 5 | i |
| 6 | tl |
| 7 | |
| 8 | (|
| 9 | i |
| 10 | tl |
| 11 | |
| 12 | (|
| 13 | i |
| 14 | tl |
| 15 | |
| 16 | (|
| 17 | i |
| 18 | tl |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | (|
| 23 | i |
| 24 | tl |
| 25 | |
| 26 | (|
| 27 | i |
| 10 | |

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 85 and therefore denies them.

- 86. The allegations in paragraph 86 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86 and therefore denies them.
- 87. The allegations in paragraph 87 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 87 and therefore denies them.
- 88. The allegations in paragraph 88 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 88 and therefore denies them.
- 89. The allegations in paragraph 89 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 89 and therefore denies them.

Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 Patent by Defendant Exit 41

- 90. The allegations in paragraph 90 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 90 and therefore denies them.
- 91. The allegations in paragraph 91 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 91 and therefore denies them.

- 92. The allegations in paragraph 92 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 92 and therefore denies them.
- 93. The allegations in paragraph 93 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 93 and therefore denies them.
- 94. The allegations in paragraph 94 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 94 and therefore denies them.
- 95. The allegations in paragraph 95 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 95 and therefore denies them.
- 96. The allegations in paragraph 96 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 96 and therefore denies them.
- 97. The allegations in paragraph 97 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 97 and therefore denies them.
- 98. The allegations in paragraph 98 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 98 and therefore denies them.

| 1 | 99. | The allegations in paragraph 99 do not appear to require an answer from |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 2 | QuikOrder. | However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 3 | information | sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 99 and |
| 4 | therefore der | nies them. |
| 5 | 100. | The allegations in paragraph 100 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 6 | QuikOrder. | However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 7 | information | sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 100 and |
| 8 | therefore der | nies them. |
| 9 | Direct Ir | nfringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 |
| 10 | | Patent by Defendant QuikOrder |
| 11 | 101. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 101. |
| 12 | 102. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 102. |
| 13 | 103. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 103. |
| 14 | 104. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 104. |
| 15 | 105. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 105. |
| 16 | 106. | QuikOrder admits that it had knowledge of the '850 patent by no later than the |
| 17 | date it was so | erved with the complaint in this action. QuikOrder denies the remaining allegations |
| 18 | in paragraph | 106. |
| 19 | 107. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 107. |
| 20 | 108. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 108. |
| 21 | 109. | QuikOrder admits that it had knowledge of the '850 patent by no later than the |
| 22 | date it was so | erved with the complaint in this action. QuikOrder denies the remaining allegations |
| 23 | in paragraph | 109. |
| 24 | 110. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 110. |
| 25 | 111. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 111. |
| 26 | Direct Ir | nfringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 |
| 27 | | Patent by Defendant Seamless |
| 28 | 112. | The allegations in paragraph 112 do not appear to require an answer from |
| LLP | | - 16 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS |

QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 112 and therefore denies them.

- 113. The allegations in paragraph 113 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 113 and therefore denies them.
- 114. The allegations in paragraph 114 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 114 and therefore denies them.
- 115. The allegations in paragraph 115 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 115 and therefore denies them.
- 116. The allegations in paragraph 116 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 116 and therefore denies them.
- 117. The allegations in paragraph 117 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 117 and therefore denies them.
- 118. The allegations in paragraph 118 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 118 and therefore denies them.
 - 119. The allegations in paragraph 119 do not appear to require an answer from

| 1 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
|-----|---|
| 2 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 119 and |
| 3 | therefore denies them. |
| 4 | 120. The allegations in paragraph 120 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 5 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 6 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 120 and |
| 7 | therefore denies them. |
| 8 | 121. The allegations in paragraph 121 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 9 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 10 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 121 and |
| 11 | therefore denies them. |
| 12 | 122. The allegations in paragraph 122 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 13 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 14 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 122 and |
| 15 | therefore denies them. |
| 16 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '850 |
| 17 | Patent by Defendant Onosys |
| 18 | 123. The allegations in paragraph 123 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 19 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 20 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 123 and |
| 21 | therefore denies them. |
| 22 | 124. The allegations in paragraph 124 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 23 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 24 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 124 and |
| 25 | therefore denies them. |
| 26 | 125. The allegations in paragraph 125 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 27 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 28 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 125 and |
| TID | 1 0 |

2

5

10

12

13

11

14 15

17

18

16

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

The allegations in paragraph 126 do not appear to require an answer from 126. QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 126 and therefore denies them.

- 127. The allegations in paragraph 127 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 127 and therefore denies them.
- The allegations in paragraph 128 do not appear to require an answer from 128. QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 128 and therefore denies them.
- 129. The allegations in paragraph 129 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 129 and therefore denies them.
- 130. The allegations in paragraph 130 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 130 and therefore denies them.
- 131. The allegations in paragraph 131 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 131 and therefore denies them.
- 132. The allegations in paragraph 132 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 132 and

| 1 | therefore denies them. |
|----|---|
| 2 | 133. The allegations in paragraph 133 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 3 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 4 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 133 and |
| 5 | therefore denies them. |
| 6 | <u>COUNT II</u> |
| 7 | Patent Infringement (U.S. Pat. No. 6,871,325) |
| 8 | (35 U.S.C. § 271) |
| 9 | 134. QuikOrder reiterates and reincorporates its responses set forth in paragraphs 1-20 |
| 10 | as if set forth fully herein. |
| 11 | 135. QuikOrder admits that Exhibit B appears to be a copy of United States Patent |
| 12 | No. 6,871,325 entitled "Information Management and Synchronous Communications System |
| 13 | with Menu Generation" ("the '325 patent") and that the document speaks for itself. QuikOrder |
| 14 | denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 135. |
| 15 | 136. QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to |
| 16 | the truth of the allegations in paragraph 136 and therefore denies them. |
| 17 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 18 | Patent by Defendant Pizza Hut |
| 19 | 137. The allegations in paragraph 137 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 20 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 21 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 137 and |
| 22 | therefore denies them. |
| 23 | 138. The allegations in paragraph 138 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 24 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 25 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 138 and |
| 26 | therefore denies them. |
| 27 | 139. The allegations in paragraph 139 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 28 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| LP | - 20 - Case No. 3:11-cy-01810-JLS-NLS |

| 1 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 146 and |
|-----|---|
| 2 | therefore denies them. |
| 3 | 147. The allegations in paragraph 147 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 4 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 5 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 147 and |
| 6 | therefore denies them. |
| 7 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 8 | Patent by Defendant Domino's |
| 9 | 148. The allegations in paragraph 148 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 10 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 11 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 148 and |
| 12 | therefore denies them. |
| 13 | 149. The allegations in paragraph 149 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 14 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 15 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 149 and |
| 16 | therefore denies them. |
| 17 | 150. The allegations in paragraph 150 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 18 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 19 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 150 and |
| 20 | therefore denies them. |
| 21 | 151. The allegations in paragraph 151 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 22 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 23 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 151 and |
| 24 | therefore denies them. |
| 25 | 152. The allegations in paragraph 152 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 26 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 27 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 152 and |
| 28 | therefore denies them. |
| ттр | 20 |

| 1 | 153. The allegations in paragraph 153 do not appear to require an answer from |
|-----|---|
| 2 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 3 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 153 and |
| 4 | therefore denies them. |
| 5 | 154. The allegations in paragraph 154 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 6 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 7 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 154 and |
| 8 | therefore denies them. |
| 9 | 155. The allegations in paragraph 155 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 10 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 11 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 155 and |
| 12 | therefore denies them. |
| 13 | 156. The allegations in paragraph 156 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 14 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 15 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 156 and |
| 16 | therefore denies them. |
| 17 | 157. The allegations in paragraph 157 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 18 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 19 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 157 and |
| 20 | therefore denies them. |
| 21 | 158. The allegations in paragraph 158 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 22 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 23 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 158 and |
| 24 | therefore denies them. |
| 25 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 26 | Patent by Defendant Papa John's |
| 27 | 159. The allegations in paragraph 159 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 28 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| LLP | - 23 - Case No. 3:11-cy-01810-JLS-N |

| 1 | 180. The allegations in paragraph 180 do not appear to require an answer from |
|----|---|
| 2 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 3 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 180 and |
| 4 | therefore denies them. |
| 5 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 6 | Patent by Defendant GrubHub |
| 7 | 181. The allegations in paragraph 181 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 8 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 9 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 181 and |
| 10 | therefore denies them. |
| 11 | 182. The allegations in paragraph 182 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 12 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 13 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 182 and |
| 14 | therefore denies them. |
| 15 | 183. The allegations in paragraph 183 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 16 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 17 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 183 and |
| 18 | therefore denies them. |
| 19 | 184. The allegations in paragraph 184 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 20 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 21 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 184 and |
| 22 | therefore denies them. |
| 23 | 185. The allegations in paragraph 185 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 24 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 25 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 185 and |
| 26 | therefore denies them. |
| 27 | 186. The allegations in paragraph 186 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 28 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |

| 1 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 186 and |
|-----|---|
| 2 | therefore denies them. |
| 3 | 187. The allegations in paragraph 187 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 4 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 5 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 187 and |
| 6 | therefore denies them. |
| 7 | 188. The allegations in paragraph 188 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 8 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 9 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 188 and |
| 10 | therefore denies them. |
| 11 | 189. The allegations in paragraph 189 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 12 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 13 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 189 and |
| 14 | therefore denies them. |
| 15 | 190. The allegations in paragraph 190 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 16 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 17 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 190 and |
| 18 | therefore denies them. |
| 19 | 191. The allegations in paragraph 191 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 20 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 21 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 191 and |
| 22 | therefore denies them. |
| 23 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 24 | Patent by Defendant LaughStub |
| 25 | 192. The allegations in paragraph 192 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 26 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 27 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 192 and |
| 28 | therefore denies them. |
| LLP | - 28 - Case No. 3:11-cy-01810-JLS- |

| 1 | 200. The allegations in paragraph 200 do not appear to require an answer from |
|-----|---|
| 2 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 3 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 200 and |
| 4 | therefore denies them. |
| 5 | 201. The allegations in paragraph 201 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 6 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 7 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 201 and |
| 8 | therefore denies them. |
| 9 | 202. The allegations in paragraph 202 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 10 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 11 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 202 and |
| 12 | therefore denies them. |
| 13 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 |
| 14 | Patent by Defendant Exit 41 |
| 15 | 203. The allegations in paragraph 203 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 16 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 17 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 203 and |
| 18 | therefore denies them. |
| 19 | 204. The allegations in paragraph 204 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 20 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 21 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 204 and |
| 22 | therefore denies them. |
| 23 | 205. The allegations in paragraph 205 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 24 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| 25 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 205 and |
| 26 | therefore denies them. |
| 27 | 206. The allegations in paragraph 206 do not appear to require an answer from |
| 28 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or |
| LLP | - 30 - Case No. 3:11-cy-01810-IL-S-N |

| 1 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 213 and | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | therefore denies them. | | |
| 3 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 | | |
| 4 | | Patent by Defendant QuikOder | |
| 5 | 214. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 214. | |
| 6 | 215. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 215. | |
| 7 | 216. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 216. | |
| 8 | 217. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 217. | |
| 9 | 218. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 218. | |
| 10 | 219. | QuikOrder admits that it had knowledge of the '325 patent by no later than the | |
| 11 | date it was served with the complaint in this action. QuikOrder denies the remaining allegation | | |
| 12 | in paragraph 219. | | |
| 13 | 220. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 220. | |
| 14 | 221. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 221. | |
| 15 | 222. | QuikOrder admits that it had knowledge of the '325 patent by no later than the | |
| 16 | date it was served with the complaint in this action. QuikOrder denies the remaining allegation | | |
| 17 | in paragraph 222. | | |
| 18 | 223. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 223. | |
| 19 | 224. | QuikOrder denies the allegations in paragraph 224. | |
| 20 | Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325 | | |
| 21 | | Patent by Defendant Seamless | |
| 22 | 225. | The allegations in paragraph 225 do not appear to require an answer from | |
| 23 | QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or | | |
| 24 | information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 225 and | | |
| 25 | therefore denies them. | | |
| 26 | 226. | The allegations in paragraph 226 do not appear to require an answer from | |
| 27 | QuikOrder. H | However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or | |
| 28 | information s | ufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 226 and | |
| LP | | 27 Com No 2.11 to 01010 H C NI | |

227. The allegations in paragraph 227 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 227 and therefore denies them.

- 228. The allegations in paragraph 228 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 228 and therefore denies them.
- 229. The allegations in paragraph 229 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 229 and therefore denies them.
- 230. The allegations in paragraph 230 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 230 and therefore denies them.
- 231. The allegations in paragraph 231 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 231 and therefore denies them.
- 232. The allegations in paragraph 232 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 232 and therefore denies them.
- 233. The allegations in paragraph 233 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 233 and

DEFENDANT OUIKORDER, INC.'S AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO AMERANTH,

| 1 |
|----|
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |

| . 1 | C | 1 . | . 1 |
|-----|---------|---------|--------|
| th | erefore | daniac | tham |
| | CICIOIC | UCITIES | THEIL. |

- 234. The allegations in paragraph 234 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 234 and therefore denies them.
- 235. The allegations in paragraph 235 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 235 and therefore denies them.

<u>Direct Infringement, Inducing Infringement, and Contributing to Infringement of the '325</u> Patent by Defendant Onosys

- 236. The allegations in paragraph 236 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 236 and therefore denies them.
- 237. The allegations in paragraph 237 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 237 and therefore denies them.
- 238. The allegations in paragraph 238 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 238 and therefore denies them.
- 239. The allegations in paragraph 239 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 239 and therefore denies them.
 - 240. The allegations in paragraph 240 do not appear to require an answer from

26

QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 240 and therefore denies them.

- 241. The allegations in paragraph 241 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 241 and therefore denies them.
- 242. The allegations in paragraph 242 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 242 and therefore denies them.
- 243. The allegations in paragraph 243 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 243 and therefore denies them.
- 244. The allegations in paragraph 244 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 244 and therefore denies them.
- 245. The allegations in paragraph 245 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 245 and therefore denies them.
- 246. The allegations in paragraph 246 do not appear to require an answer from QuikOrder. However, to the extent an answer is required, QuikOrder is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 246 and therefore denies them.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

2

QuikOrder denies that Ameranth is entitled to any of the relief requested in Nos. 1-9 of Ameranth's Prayer for Relief.

3 4

II. **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

6

5

admitting any allegations of the Complaint not otherwise admitted and without assuming any

Further responding to the Complaint, QuikOrder asserts the following defenses, without

7

burden where such burden would otherwise be on Ameranth.

8

9

First Affirmative Defense (Non-Infringement)

10

1. QuikOrder has not infringed and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any valid claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent.

11 12

QuikOrder's product does not have each of the limitations in any of the asserted claims. For

13 example, QuikOrder does not have a central database or a handheld computing device as required

by the claims.

2.

14

15

16

Second Affirmative Defense (Invalidity) One or more of the claims of the '850 patent or the '325 patent is invalid for

17 18

failing to meet the conditions for patentability as set forth in one or more sections of Title 35 of

19

the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112 for one or

20

more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions served on

21 22

invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as **Exhibit A**.) For example, the asserted patents are

23

Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and

24

103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No.

25

7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claims of

26

the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best

27

mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application

28

program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., as

Case 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS Document 232 Filed 07/17/12 Page 37 of 41

| 1 | | THE PARTIES | |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 2 | 2. | QuikOrder, Inc. ("QuikOrder") is an Illinois corporation having a principal place | |
| 3 | of business a | t 351 W. Hubbard St., Suite 501, Chicago, Illinois, 60654. | |
| 4 | 3. | On information and belief, Ameranth, Inc. ("Ameranth") is a Delaware corporation | |
| 5 | based in San | Diego, California and having a principal place of business at 5820 Oberlin Drive, | |
| 6 | Suite 22, San Diego California. | | |
| 7 | JURISDICTION AND VENUE | | |
| 8 | 4. | This Counterclaim arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § | |
| 9 | 101 et seq. and under the declaratory judgments laws of the United States, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and | | |
| 10 | 2202. | | |
| 11 | 5. | Jurisdiction of this counterclaim arises under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 and | |
| 12 | under 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a). | | |
| 13 | 6. | By virtue of Ameranth's action for infringement of the '850 patent and the '325 | |
| 14 | patent, filed | September 13, 2011 in the Southern District California, a justiciable controversy | |
| 15 | exists between QuikOrder and Ameranth concerning the validity and scope of Ameranth's alleged | | |
| 16 | rights with respect to the '850 patent and the '325 patent. | | |
| 17 | 7. | Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400. | |
| 18 | 8. | Ameranth is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District. | |
| 19 | | FIRST COUNTERCLAIM | |
| 20 | | (Declaratory Judgment Of Noninfringement) | |
| 21 | 9. | QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 8 of this Counterclaim | |
| 22 | as if fully set | forth herein. | |
| 23 | 10. | There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy | |
| 24 | between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, noninfringement of the '850 patent and | | |
| 25 | the '325 pate | ent. | |
| 26 | 11. | QuikOrder has not infringed and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, literally or | |
| 27 | under the do | ctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent. QuikOrder's | |
| 28 | product does | not have each of the limitations in any of the asserted claims. For example, | |
| LLP w | DEFENDANT | - 38 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS | |

| claims. 12. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that QuikOrder has not infring and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent. SECOND COUNTERCLAIM (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 in 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., sexplained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | | f I | | |
|---|----|--|--|--|
| 12. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that QuikOrder has not infring and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent. SECOND COUNTERCLAIM (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section. Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. | 1 | QuikOrder does not have a central database or a handheld computing device as required by the | | |
| and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent. SECOND COUNTERCLAIM (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section. Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 (103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 2 | claims. | | |
| SECOND COUNTERCLAIM (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. 17. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 3 | 12. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that QuikOrder has not infringed | | |
| 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '32 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. 17. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 4 | and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '850 patent or the '325 patent. | | |
| (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. 17. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 5 | SECOND COUNTEDCLAIM | | |
| fully set forth herein. 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more sections. Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 6 | (Declaratory Judgment Of Invalidity) | | |
| between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 7 | 13. QuikOrder incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-12 of this Counterclaim as if | | |
| between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , invalidity of the '850 patent and the patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more sections. Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 8 | fully set forth herein. | | |
| patent. 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more section: Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A.) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 9 | 14. There is an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy | | |
| 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more sections. Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. 17. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 10 | between QuikOrder and Ameranth regarding, inter alia, invalidity of the '850 patent and the '325 | | |
| Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 11 one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions serve Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 11 | patent. | | |
| one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions server Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 12 | 15. The claims of the '850 and '325 patents are invalid under one or more sections of | | |
| Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 13 | Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112 for | | |
| invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 14 | one or more of the reasons specified in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions served on | | |
| Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 at 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., at explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 15 | Ameranth on June 18, 2012. (Attached as Exhibit A .) For example, the asserted patents are | | |
| 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 16 | invalid because they are not patentable subject matter under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. | | |
| 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claim the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 17 | Further, the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and | | |
| the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 18 | 103 in light of at least U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,976, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,268 and U.S. Pat. No. | | |
| mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 19 | 7,966,215, each of which discloses every element of each asserted claim. The asserted claims of | | |
| program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., a explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 20 | the patents-in-suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the written disclosure, enablement and best | | |
| explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 21 | mode requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, including but not limited to the terms "application | | |
| 24 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '3 25 patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. 26 PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 22 | program interface," "a communication control module," synchronous communication," etc., as | | |
| patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 23 | explained in Defendants' Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. | | |
| PRAYER FOR RELIEF | 24 | 16. QuikOrder is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the '850 patent and the '325 | | |
| | 25 | patent, and each claim thereof, are invalid. | | |
| WHEREFORE, Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff QuikOrder, Inc. respectfully reques | 26 | PRAYER FOR RELIEF | | |
| | 27 | WHEREFORE, Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff QuikOrder, Inc. respectfully request | | |
| | | that this Court enter judgment in its favor and against Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Ameranth, | | |
| - 39 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS DEFENDANT QUIKORDER, INC.'S AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO AMERANT | | - 39 - Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS DEFENDANT QUIKORDER, INC.'S AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO AMERANTH, INC.'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | | |

1 Inc. as follows: 2 A. Declare that QuikOrder has not infringed and is not infringing, directly or 3 indirectly, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '850 patent or the 4 '325 patent; В. 5 Declare that each claim of the '850 patent and the '325 patent is invalid; 6 C. Declare that the '850 patent and the '325 patent are unenforceable against 7 QuikOrder; D. 8 Declare that Ameranth is not entitled to any damages, interest, costs, 9 attorney fees or other relief from or against QuikOrder; E. 10 Declare that this is an "exceptional case" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 11 § 285, and award QuikOrder reasonable attorneys fees, expenses and costs in this action; 12 and F. 13 Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 14 15 Dated: July 17, 2012 SCHIFF HARDIN LLP 16 17 By: /s/ George C. Yu George C. Yu 18 Attorneys for Defendant OuikOrder, Inc. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 - 40 -Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS

Case 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS Document 232 Filed 07/17/12 Page 40 of 41

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that, on July 17, 2012, the foregoing document was filed via the Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (CM/ECF) system, and was served on all parties via the automated generation and e-mailing of a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) by the CM/ECF system to counsel for all parties. /s/ George C. Yu George C. Yu E-Mail: gyu@schiffhardin.com - 41 -Case No. 3:11-cv-01810-JLS-NLS

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO